# *DRAFT*
# Appendix B – 2011 Budget Submittal Business Plan Information

## Contents

# *DRAFT*
# Appendix B – 2011 Budget Submittal Business Plan Information

## Policy Framework

Section 2.16.07 of the King County Code establishes Central IT framework and the technology governance structure.  Some changes to this code are currently under consideration in order to acknowledge organizational updates that have occurred as a result of the IT reorganization program.  Included within this proposal is the need to align budget responsibility with organizational responsibility for IT within the executive branch.

In general, this legislation directs Central IT to:

- Create and manage a countywide *Strategic Technology Plan* and report progress against that plan utilizing a *Technology Business Plan* (for the next year) and an *Annual Technology Report* (for the prior year).
- Perform IT project oversight including responsibility for:
    - Determining IT project processes including project justification and initiation, ongoing monitoring and oversight, and completion criteria
    - Releasing funding to projects based on progress
    - Suspending or closing projects with unresolved issues related to scope, schedule, or budget.
- Provide enterprise level IT services including:
    - Countywide infrastructure and contracted departmental/agency information systems
    - Cable television and communications code provisions and franchises
    - Telephone systems
    - Radio Communications Services
    - I-Net operations
- Conduct technology governance activities focused on providing advice from all departments to the CIO on technology related issues, policies, and programs including:
    - SAC – Strategic Advisory Council– advice directed to the Executive
    - BMC – Business Management Council
    - TMB – Technology Management Board
    - PRB – Project Review Board

Additional policy direction is provided by:

- Executive order (INF 8-8 (AEO)) which further clarifies CIO and agency responsibilities.
- The *Strategic Technology Plan*
    - Guiding Principles provide a standard and cost effective approach to IT service delivery
    - Aligns with business strategy and will be updated in April 2011 for County Wide Strategic Plan (CWSP) alignment

- o 2011 major drivers are the ABT project and improving IT maturity among others
- Periodically, Council legislation will add programs such as the recent open data ordinance

## Strategic Technology Direction

### *Vision*
King County's technology vision is identified in the Strategic Technology Plan as:

> *All county information and information-based services are cost-effective, reliable, and easy to access and use by the public, by private companies, and internal staff through web-based technologies with appropriate security and privacy controls.*

### *Mission*
Information Technology at King County strives to meet the county's business needs through the effective application of technology.  However, IT has not created a mission statement in the past due to the separation of IT into various departments and agencies.  As reorganization occurs in the Executive branch so that IT staff report to IT management reporting to the CIO, a mission statement becomes a viable and valuable tool.  For that reason, developing a Mission statement is a strategic outcome identified in the Strategic Technology Plan.  Once the mission has been identified, it will be included in future planning documents.

### *Strategic Technology Goals and Objectives*
As part of the Strategic Technology Plan, King County has developed four strategic technology goals. These goals drive all existing investments and where possible, operational activities. The four goals are:

- *Goal #1:   Efficiency*
- *Goal #2:  Customer Service & Public Access*
- *Goal #3:  Transparency and Accountability*
- *Goal #4:  Enhanced risk management*

Supporting strategies, objectives (41)  and outcome measures (~250) have been defined for each of these goals and are available on-line in the Strategic Technology Plan 2009-2012 at:
> http://www.kingcounty.gov/business/oirm/governance/strategicservices/strategicreports/2009-20012%20Strategic%20Technology%20Plan.aspx

## Base Budget Description

**INTERNAL SERVICES FUND**

TECHNOLOGY SERVICES FUND

# *DRAFT*
# Appendix B – 2011 Budget Submittal Business Plan Information

Technology services fund with the budget of $27M is the largest operating fund managed by OIRM. Almost half of the total budget ($12.5M) represents a base budget for the majority of IT Enterprise Services operations such as Network, Internet/Intranet, Messaging, Active Directory, Blackberry Support, Enterprise Equipment Replacement, IT Project Management Office, OIRM Help Desk, IT Business Continuity, and the new open data initiative.  These services provide direct support for County businesses to allow the County to deliver goals according to the newly adopted King County Strategic Plan.

Other services are mostly provided individually for interested agencies based on customers' service level agreements to also support County businesses.  These include:

- Application development services ($5.4M) that develop and maintains computer applications. Mainframe services ($3.5M) to host applications in the mainframe with job staging and mainframe printing.
- Servers Maintenance, data base, and backup services ($1.2M)
- Integrated Solution Center ($0.4M) performs application and data integration services currently used by Superior Court, Prosecuting Attorney, and the Sheriff's Office.
- King County Data Center Operations ($0.8M) provides servers and network equipment hosting in the new state of the art data center that is staffed 24X7 with built in redundancy and cooling system qualified for energy savings initiatives.

Included in the Technology Services fund base budget is $2.5M for the debt repayment of the new data center and other central rates charges from internal services agencies.  Another $0.8M is for services to other OIRM funds and projects such as LAN services and IT Asset Management.

OIRM OPERATING FUND

This fund with the total base budget of $6M accounts for CIO management office and county-wide IT oversight ($1.2M), IT governance and Strategic Planning ($0.8M), IT Security and Privacy ($0.3M), IT business support, fiscal management, human resources management, OIRM administration/office expenses ($1.5M), central rate charges, OIRM space lease ($2.3M) for all OIRM funds.  The central supports (such as space lease and IT business support) were further allocated to those OIRM funds resulted in the net OIRM operating fund budget of $4.2M.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS FUND

Telecommunication with the base budget of $2.2M performs network architecture oversight, telecom contract management, vendor charge allocations, cabling related move/add/changes, administer voicemail systems, telecom equipment vendor management, vendor management on all telecom related services (wireless and non-wireless)

**ENTERPRISE SERVICES**

# *DRAFT*
# Appendix B – 2011 Budget Submittal Business Plan Information

RADIO COMMUNICATIONS

Radio Communications has an operation base budget of $3M, providing emergency radio support, especially for law safety and justice agencies and emergency personnel throughout the region  The amount reflects cost of operation to maintain emergency radio infrastructure and maintenance of equipment of $1.3M.  Another $.85M is the base cost for the radio installation in customers' sites/vehicles.  Radio Communications provides infrastructure and installation/maintenance services to over 200 discreet customers.   Internally, the Sheriff's Office is one of Radio's major customers followed by DOT Roads and the Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention.  Other external customers include fire districts, hospitals, public schools, utilities and cities.  Radio management, oversight, and business cost (space lease, central charges, administration charges, etc) amounted to $.85M.  This includes not only operation cost and oversight, but also regional radio communication coordination, legislation management, and representation at many governance organizations or regulatory organizations such as: the King County Regional Communication Board,  Radio Executive Policy Committee, Puget Sound Regional Interoperability Executive Committee, State Interoperability Executive Committee, and the 700/800 MHz Region Planning Committees .

I-NET OPERATIONS

I-Net operation's base budget is $2.6M.  I-Net is an enterprise fund and self-funded from users of I-Net services and cable TV PEG fees.  I-Net provides network bandwidth transport and Internet access.  Per franchise agreement,  I-Net  is to provide services to public, education, and governments entities, as a low cost alternative to commercial services.   Other services include IP addresses, T1's, video, technical support, access to inter-governmental networks, engineering,  project management and installations services.   I-Net customers include; King County Wide Area Network, School Districts and Colleges, Libraries, Hospitals, Cities, Courts, and non-profit entities.

**GENERAL FUND**

CABLE COMMUNICATIONS

Office of Cable Communications with a base budget of $0.3M manages the County's cable TV franchise agreements and ensures appropriate collections of cable TV franchise and PEG fee of about $3.5M/year from companies that hold a cable TV franchise agreement with the County.  The office also provides resources to respond to customers' complaints and questions related to cable TV services and system within unincorporated King County.

# Appendix B – 2011 Budget Submittal Business Plan Information

## Change Drivers

Submitted in Prior Memo

## Countywide Strategic Plan Alignment

Due 9/13

## 2011 Budget changes and Prioritization Criteria

Due 9/13

## Performance Measures

1. **Budget Change A**:  XX% Reduction within Enterprise Business Solutions

   **Performance Measure A1**:  Active Directory Server Availability

   | Target | | | | | Actual Performance | | | |
   |---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
   | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 1st Q 2010 |
   | n/a | n/a | 99.99% | 99.99% | 99.99% | n/a | n/a | 100.0% | 100.0% |

   **Performance Measure A2**:  E-mail Server Availability

   | Target | | | | | Actual Performance | | | |
   |---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
   | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 1st Q |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **2010** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 99.90% | 99.90% | 99.90% | 99.90% | 99.90% | 99.996% | 100.0% | 99.92% | 100.0% |

**Performance Measure A3**:  Blackberry Server Availability

| Target | | | | | Actual Performance | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **1$^{st}$ Q 2010** |
| 99.90% | 99.90% | 99.90% | 99.90% | 99.90% | 99.96% | 99.97% | 99.89% | 100.0% |

**Performance Measure A4**:  Security Server Availability – Centralized Management of Security Tools (HIDs, anti-virus, anti-spyware, etc.) (ePO)

| Target | | | | | Actual Performance | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **1$^{st}$ Q 2010** |
| 99.50% | 99.50% | 99.80% | 99.80% | 99.80% | 99.90% | 99.97% | 99.65% | 100.0% |

**Performance Measure A5**:  Security Server Availability – Enterprise Vulnerability Scanner (Foundstone)

| Target | | | | | Actual Performance | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **1$^{st}$ Q 2010** |
| 99.50% | 99.50% | 99.80% | 99.80% | 99.80% | 99.90% | 100.0% | 99.91% | 100.0% |

# Appendix B – 2011 Budget Submittal Business Plan Information

**Performance Measure A6**:  # E-mails Directed at King County Annually (that must be filtered for potential SPAM)

| Target | | | | | Actual Performance | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2007** | **2008*** | **2009** | **1ˢᵗ Q 2010** |
|  |  |  |  |  | n/a | 98.6 Mil | 43.9 Mill | 11.5 Mil |

- 2008 saw a significantly higher volume of e-mails directed at King County than in 2010 and 2011.
- No targets were set for this measurement.

**Performance Measure A7**:  Enterprise Application Availability

| Target | | | | | Actual Performance | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **1ˢᵗ Q 2010** |
| 99.60% | 99.60% | 99.70% | 99.70% | 99.70% | 99.999% | 99.97% | 99.997% | 100.00% |

2. **Budget Change B**:  XX% Reduction within Radio Communication Services, within Enterprise Business Solutions

**Performance Measure B1**:  # Radio Installations Provided; % Radio Installations Provided On-Time (% excludes approved exceptions)

| Target | | | | | Actual Performance | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **1ˢᵗ Q 2010** |
| 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 297/98.9% | 247/100% | 173/98.08% | 25/100% |

**Performance Measure B2:** # Radio Walk-In Repairs Provided; % Radio Walk-In Repairs Provided On-Time (% excludes approved exceptions)

| Target | | | | | Actual Performance | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **1ˢᵗ Q 2010** |
|  | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | Not reported | 659/100% | 434/100% | 89/100% |

*DRAFT*

Appendix B – 2011 Budget Submittal Business Plan Information

# Appendix B – 2011 Budget Submittal Business Plan Information

**Performance Measure B3**:  # Radio Bench-Time Repairs Provided; % Radio Bench-Time Repairs Provided On-Time (% excludes approved exceptions)

| Target | | | | | Actual Performance | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 1<sup>st</sup> Q 2010 |
|  | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | Not reported | 559/100% | 689/98.91% | 201/100% |

3. **Budget Change C**:  XX% Reduction within KCIT Customer Services

**Performance Measure C1**: Inquiries to the Office of Cable Communications and % Responded to within 10 Calendar Days

| Target | | | | | Actual Performance | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 1<sup>st</sup> Q 2010 |
|  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | Not reported | 281/100% | 357/100% | 105/100% |

**Performance Measure C2**:  # Calls to the Central Service Desk and % Calls to Central Help Desk that are Answered

| Target | | | | | Actual Performance | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 1<sup>st</sup> Q 2010 |
| 90.0% | 95.0% | 95.0% | 90.0% | 90.0% | 94.23% | 10,921/95.7% | 11,973/93.2% | 3,204/90.3% |

4. **Budget Change D**:  XX% Reduction within IT Operations

**Performance Measure D1**:  Availability of KCWAN

| Target | | | | | Actual Performance | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 1<sup>st</sup> Q 2010 |
| 99.99% | 99.99% | 99.99% | 99.99% | 99.99% | 99.999% | 99.996% | 99.994% | 100.0% |

# Appendix B – 2011 Budget Submittal Business Plan Information

**Performance Measure D2**:  Availability of Mainframe

| Target | | | | | Actual Performance | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **1$^{st}$ Q 2010** |
| 99.70% | 99.70% | 99.70% | 99.70% | 99.70% | 99.71% | 99.79% | 99.83% | 99.92% |

**Performance Measure D3**:  Availability of KC Homepage

| Target | | | | | Actual Performance | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **1$^{st}$ Q 2010** |
| 99.80% | 99.70% | 99.80% | 99.80% | 99.80% | 99.86% | 99.74% | 99.87% | 99.92% |

**Performance Measure D4**:  # of Total Nightly Tape Backups Attempted and % Successful Nightly Tape Backups

| Target | | | | | Actual Performance | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **1$^{st}$ Q 2010** |
| 95% | 97.0% | 97.0% | 97.0% | 97.0% | 64,440/99.10% | 69,007/98.95% | 70,671/99.1% | 21,418/98% |

**Performance Measure D5**:  # of Mainframe Jobs Run and % Mainframe Jobs Run On-Time

| Target | | | | | Actual Performance | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **1$^{st}$ Q 2010** |
| | | n/a | 96.0% | 96.0% | Not reported | Not reported | 125,481/99.8% | 30,788/99.7% |

- Information for 2007 and 2008 is available but was not part of the Performance Measurement Program these years.

**Performance Measure D6**:  % Staff Available at Central Data Center

# *DRAFT*
## Appendix B – 2011 Budget Submittal Business Plan Information

| Target | | | | | Actual Performance | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **1$^{st}$ Q 2010** |
| 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

# *DRAFT*

# Appendix B – 2011 Budget Submittal Business Plan Information

5. **Budget Change E**:  XX% Reduction within IT Governance

> **Performance Measure E1**: Number Governance Meetings Held (PRB, TMB, BMC, SAC)

| Target | | | | | Actual Performance | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **1st Q 2010** |
| | | | | | Not Reported | 29 | 34 (includes 1 virtual meeting) | 10 |

- No targets were set for this measurement.

> **Performance Measure E2**: Number Governance Information Documents Posted (PRB, TMB, BMC, SAC)

| Target | | | | | Actual Performance | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **1st Q 2010** |
| | | | | | Not reported | 1,623 | 1,983 | 486 |

- No targets were set for this measurement.

> **Performance Measure E3**: Average # PRB Projects Monitored by IT Governance Staff each Year

| Target | | | | | Actual Performance | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **1st Q 2010** |
| | | | | | Not reported | 91 | 84 | 87 |

# *DRAFT*
## Appendix B – 2011 Budget Submittal Business Plan Information

- No targets were set for this measurement.